

[27th March 1928

Medical

Admission of private patients into the General Hospital.

* 1792 Q.—Mr. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the physicians and surgeons of the General Hospital issue instructions to their assistants or the assistants on duty at the General Hospital to admit their private patients in the wards assigned to them;

(b) whether instructions are also given to admit a private patient of a particular Medical Officer in the ward belonging to that officer though that day happens to be the admission day of some other officer; and

(c) whether the Medical officers in the General Hospital are allowed the use of instruments and any other appliances for their private patients outside the hospital and if so, whether the same privilege can be allowed to the members of the independent medical profession?

A.—(a) & (b) The Government have no reason to suppose that the facts are as indicated in the question. Medical officers are not allowed to treat their private patients in Government Medical institutions.

(c) Medical officers are allowed to use hospital instruments when treating their private patients, on payment of a fee. The concession cannot be extended to private medical practitioners.

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—“ May I know, Sir, whether the Government have made enquiries and satisfied themselves regarding the answers to (a) and (b) ? ”

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR:—“ As I have said on a previous occasion regarding this matter, the inquiry of the Government will be facilitated if the hon. Member will give one or two instances.”

Registration

Reduction of the private attendance fees for the registration of documents.

* 1793 Q.—MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB Bahadur: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the reduction of the private attendance fees for registration of documents from Rs. 20 to Rs. 15 does not help the poor gosha women very much and that they still find it very hard to pay Rs. 15 even for a small document of Rs. 25;

(b) whether the Government propose to reduce it to the former rate of Rs. 10;

(c) whether it is a fact that the Registrars do not give any concession at all;

(d) how many cases of such concessions there were during the last six years in South Kanara;

(e) whether it is a fact that in order to get the concession even the poorest people have to pay the batta in the first instance before registration and apply again before their case for concession can be considered; and

(f) whether the Government propose to lay down that in the case of poor people their case may be considered and decided whether they are entitled to the concession before the registration begins?

27th March 1928]

A.—(a) & (c) to (f) The Government have no information. A report has been called for.

(b) No. The effects of the recent reduction of fees from Rs. 20 to Rs. 15 will be watched before a further reduction is considered.

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS

Land Revenue

Villagewar list of Government waste lands according to the Tanjore resettlement report.

1794 Q.—Mr. K. S. SIVASUBRAHMANYA AYYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) will the Government be pleased to call for and lay on the table a villagewar list of the area of the Government waste lands with their taram, and present acreage market value according to the Tanjore Resettlement Report, and the acreage value as per recent sales and lease transactions of adjacent patta lands between the ten years 1918-27; and

(b) whether the Government will be pleased to state the amount awarded to the parties on the average acre of wet and dry lands acquired for canal excavation by the Special Deputy Collectors?

A.—(a) The Government do not understand the question. The Tanjore Resettlement Report was written in 1920 and it therefore cannot contain information as to present market values nor does it contain villagewar lists of Government waste lands.

(b) Assuming that the question refers to land acquired in Tanjore district for the Mettur Project canals, the information has been called for.

Legislative

Representation of Viswakarma community in the Legislative Council.

1795 Q.—Mr. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) why the Government has not given any representation of the Viswakarma community in the Legislative Council as formed in 1923 and 1926;

(b) whether in 1923 a promise was held out to that community that when vacancies arise in the Council the question would be considered favourably;

(c) whether the Government have received both in 1923 and 1926 memorials and monster petitions from East Godavari and other districts requesting the appointment as a Member of the Legislative Council of M.R.Ry. Pandit Ganala Ramamoorthy Garu;

(d) whether his name was recommended by the District Collector for nomination to the Legislative Council; and

(e) if the answers to (c) and (d) are in the affirmative, what is the action the Government has taken or propose to take thereon?